REMARKS

GENERAL COMMENTS

The Examiner has indicated that the Applicants' arguments, on pages 10 through 32 of the previous response, filed on 01/31/2008, with respect to the rejections of Claims 6-20, 25-27, and 29 have been fully considered and are persuasive. However, upon further consideration, the Examiner has issued a new ground(s) of rejection in view of the following newly cited references: Couillard, Fischer et al., Sullivan, and Michelson et al.

CLAIMS

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11 AND 18-19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 11 and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0129290 ("Couillard").

Independent Claim 11

Regarding Claim 11, the Office Action states:

> ***Regarding claim 11***, Couilard [sic] teaches a method of transmitting time sensitive data from at least a first computing device to at least a second computing device in a communication system comprising:
>
> requesting absolute time from a network time protocol (NTP) server;
>
> receiving said absolute time; and
>
> inputting an adjustment parameter derived from said absolute time into a circuitry to synchronize said at least a first computing device to said at least a second computing device (paragraphs [0047]-[0052]).

See Office Action at page 2.

Claim 11 recites "A method comprising:

requesting absolute time from a server by a first computing device, wherein said server uses a Network Time Protocol (NTP); receiving said absolute time by said first computing device; and inputting an adjustment parameter derived from said absolute time into a circuitry of said first computing device to synchronize said first computing device to a second computing device, wherein a rate at which said requesting is performed is varied based on a particular synchronization accuracy desired at said first computing device and at said second computing device; and transmitting time sensitive data from said first computing device to said second computing device."

The Examiner references Couillard, at paragraphs [0047] through [0052], which states:

> [0047] The timing devices 4 and 6 of the first and second client stations 1 and 5, respectively, are synchronized independently of one another to the timing device 22 of the time server 3. In step 200 the first client station 1 receives a first synchronization signal from the time server 3 via the communications network 2 and attaches a local time of receipt of said first synchronization signal. Conveniently, when the timing device 4 is embodied on a time stamping cipher module of the first client station, the first client station 1 simply time stamps the first synchronization signal using a time value provided by the timing device 4. Advantageously, the time stamp may further include an authenticator for identifying the first client station 1. The first client station 1 returns the time stamped first synchronization signal to the time server 3. Upon receipt of the time stamped first synchronization signal at the time server 3, the time server 3 determines a round trip delay time of the first synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2. The time server 3 processes said time stamped first synchronization signal using processor 9 to determine a time offset value for synchronizing timing device 4 in dependence upon a difference between the local

time of receipt of the first synchronization signal at the first client station, the expected local time of receipt of the first synchronization signal at the first client station and the determined round trip delay time of the first synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2. Time server 3 sends a signal in dependence upon the determined time offset value to the first client station 1 via the communications network 2. Processor 7 of client station 1 adds said time offset value to the local time value maintained by timing device 4. Of course, the time server is a "read only" device, such that synchronization between the first client station 1 and the time server 3 is effected by adjusting only the value maintained by timing device 4 of the first client station 1.

[0048] In step 201 the second client station 5 receives a second synchronization signal from the time server 3 via the communications network 2 and attaches a local time of receipt of said second synchronization signal. Conveniently, when the timing device 6 is embodied on a time stamping cipher module of the second client station, the second client station 5 simply time stamps the second synchronization signal using a time value provided by the timing device 6. Advantageously, the time stamp may further include an authenticator for identifying the second client station 5. The second client station 5 returns the time stamped second synchronization signal to the time server 3. Upon receipt of the time stamped second synchronization signal at the time server 3, the time server 3 determines a round trip delay time of the second synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2. The time server 3 processes said time stamped second synchronization signal using processor 9 to determine a time offset value for synchronizing timing device 6 in dependence upon a difference between the local time of receipt of the second synchronization signal at the second client station, the expected local time of receipt of the second synchronization signal at the second client station and the determined round trip delay time of the second synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2. Time server 3 sends a signal in dependence upon the determined time offset value to the second client station 5 via the communications network 2. Processor 8 of client station 5

adds said time offset value to the local time value maintained by timing device 6. Of course, the time server is a "read only" device, such that synchronization between the second client station 5 and the time server 3 is effected by adjusting only the value maintained by timing device 6 of the second client station 5.

[0049] Similarly, in step 202 the first client station 1 and the second client station 5, synchronize with each other via the communications network 2. The first client station 1 time stamps a third synchronization signal with a time of transmission using a local time provided by timing device 4. The first client station 1 transmits said third synchronization signal to the second client station 5 via the communications network 2. Upon receipt of said third synchronization signal the second client station 5 time stamps the third synchronization signal with a local time of receipt provided by the timing device 6 and returns said time stamped third synchronization signal to the first client station 1 via the communications network 2. Upon receipt of the timestamped third synchronization signal at the first client station 1, the first client station 1 determines a round trip delay time of the third synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2. The first client station 1 processes said time stamped third synchronization signal using processor 7 and determines synchronization data for synchronizing timing device 4 and timing device 6 in dependence upon a difference between the local time of receipt of the third synchronization signal at the second client station 5, the expected local time of receipt of the third synchronization signal at the second client station 5 and the determined round trip delay time of the third synchronization signal caused by the communications network 2.

[0050] Timing devices 4 and 6 are synchronized. Processor 7 of client station 1 uses said synchronization data to adjust a local time value maintained by timing device 4 to be approximately a same time value as the local time value maintained by timing device 6. More preferably, processor 7 of client station 1 transmits a signal including said synchronization data to client station 5. Processor 7 of client station 1 and processor 8 of client station 5 use said synchronization

data to adjust the local time values maintained by each of timing devices 4 and 6, respectively, to be a time value approximately intermediate the two local time values maintained by each of timing devices 4 and 6.

[0051] Step 203 is optionally performed, wherein the system determines a value relating to a precision of the synchronization method based on the first set of synchronization signals.

[0052] The steps 200, 201 and 202 as described above are repeated at steps 200a, 201a and 202a. For instance a second set of synchronization signals are exchanged for performing the method outlined with reference to steps 200, 201 and 202. Having performed steps 200, 201 and 202 and steps 200a, 201a and 202a, the system determines at step 204 statistical data relating to a precision of the synchronization and to a convergence of the synchronization method based on the first set of synchronization signals or the value relating to a precision of the synchronization determined optionally in step 203, and the second set of synchronization signals. The statistical data determined at step 204 is compared to threshold values at step 205 to determine if the precision of the synchronization is within a predetermined tolerance. The predetermined tolerance varies in dependence upon the level of precision and accuracy that are required by each unique system. When the precision of the synchronization is within a predetermined tolerance the system is synchronized and the method terminates at step 207.

Applicants respectfully submit that Couillard does not teach each and every element and/or feature recited in Claim 11. For example, Couillard does not teach "wherein said server uses a Network Time Protocol (NTP)," as recited in Claim 11. While Couillard teaches a "time server," Couillard does not teach a server that "uses a Network Time Protocol (NTP). Therefore, for this reason alone, the Office Action has not shown a teaching of what is recited in Claim 11. Furthermore, Couillard does not teach "inputting an adjustment parameter derived from said

absolute time into a circuitry of said first computing device to synchronize said first computing device to a second computing device, *wherein a rate at which said requesting is performed is varied based on a particular synchronization accuracy desired at said first computing device and at said second computing device*," as recited in Claim 11 (emphasis denoted in italics). Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action does not show a teaching of each and every element and/or feature recited in Claim 11. Therefore, based on the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that Claim 11 contains patentable subject matter. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the patentable subject matter in Claim 11 should be advanced to allowance. Furthermore, for at least the reason that Claims 12-17 depend on an allowable independent Claim 11, Claims 12-17 should be allowed as well. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claims 11-17.

Independent Claim 19

Regarding Claim 19, the Office Action states:

> ***Regarding claim 19***, Couilard [sic] teaches a method of synchronizing a transmitting computing device to a receiving computing device of a packet switched telecommunication network comprising:
>
> requesting absolute time from a network time protocol (NTP) server;
>
> receiving said absolute time; and
>
> inputting an adjustment parameter into a frequency controlling hardware of said transmitting computing device or said receiving computing device (paragraphs [0047]-[0052]).
>
> *See* Office Action at page 3.

Claim 19 recites "A method of synchronizing a computing device in a packet switched telecommunication network comprising: requesting an absolute time from a server using a Network Time Protocol (NTP); receiving said absolute time; and inputting an adjustment parameter into a frequency controlling hardware of a frequency oscillator of said computing device to adjust a phase of said frequency oscillator."

The Applicant respectfully submits that Couillard does not teach what is recited in Claim 19. For example, while Couillard discloses a "time server," Couillard does not teach "a server using a Network Time Protocol (NTP)," as recited in Claim 19. Furthermore, for example, Couillard does not teach "inputting an adjustment parameter *into a frequency controlling hardware of a frequency oscillator of said computing device to adjust a phase of said frequency oscillator*," as recited in Claim 19 (emphasis denoted in italics). Therefore, for each of these reasons, the Office Action has not shown a teaching of what is recited in Claim 19. Thus, Applicants believe that Claim 19 contains patentable subject matter. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the patentable subject matter in Claim 19 should be advanced to allowance. Furthermore, Claims 20-25 should be allowed for at least the reason that Claims 20-25 depend on an allowable independent Claim 19.

REJECTION OF DEPENDENT CLAIMS 16-17 AND 25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16-17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couillard in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0297541 ("Sullivan"). Regarding Claims 16-17 and 25, the Office Action states:

> Regarding claims 16-17 and 25, Couilard [sic] fails to teach said circuit comprising a frequency oscillator and wherein the frequency oscillator

> comprising a numerically controlled oscillator. However, Sullivan teaches such features in paragraph [0006] for a purpose of adjusting a clock.
>
> Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of said circuit comprising a frequency oscillator and wherein the frequency oscillator comprising a numerically controlled oscillator, as taught by Sullivan, into view of Couilard [sic] in order to synchronize a time.
>
> *See* Office Action at page 6.

Claim 16 recites "The method of Claim 11 wherein said frequency oscillator comprises a numerically controlled oscillator (NCO)."

Claim 17 recites "The method of Claim 16 wherein said frequency oscillator comprises a numerically controlled oscillator."

Claim 25 recites "The method of Claim 19 wherein said frequency oscillator comprises a numerically controlled oscillator."

The Office Action references Sullivan, at paragraph [0006], which states:

> FIG. 1 is a schematic diagram of a conventional GPS receiver 101 used for determining position. In FIG. 1, GPS receiver 101 is simplified to point out the primary relevant functions of a conventional GPS receiver. An antenna 102 receives a GPS signal from GPS satellites 103a, 103b, 103c and 103d. Antenna 102 applies the received GPS signal to a signal conditioning processor 104. Signal conditioning processor 104 amplifies, filters and downconverts the signal to baseband for processing. The baseband signal is applied to carrier and code phase tracking algorithms in processing block 106. Processing block 106 contains a multiplier 108, a correlator 110, a carrier frequency oscillator 112, a Gold code generator 114 and an integrator 116. Multiplier 108 multiplies the baseband signal by an estimated carrier frequency received from carrier frequency oscillator

> 112. Carrier frequency oscillator 112 can be a voltage controlled oscillator (VCO) or a numerically controlled oscillator (NCO). Correlator 110 correlates the signal with a replica of a Gold code generated by code generator 114. The Gold code is a unique and known code generated by each GPS satellite. The terms "code" and "Gold code" are used interchangeably herein. The output of correlator 110 is integrated in integrator 116. The output of integrator 116 is input to a digital signal processor 118 to generate information required for code tracking generator 114 and carrier frequency oscillator 112. This information includes carrier phase and code phase information.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that "Sullivan teaches such features in paragraph [0006] for a purpose of adjusting a clock." Instead, the Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan teaches away from its combination with Couillard because the frequency oscillator 112 presented in Sullivan is contained within a GPS receiver and operates to track one or more satellite signals, as illustrated in Figure 1 of Sullivan. Per Sullivan, "Fig. 1 is a schematic diagram of a conventional GPS receiver used for determining position." Applicants respectfully submit that Sullivan's frequency oscillator is used with "a multiplier, an integrator, and DSP to operate as a carrier tracking loop that compensates for errors in a down converter frequency as well as any Doppler shift associated with a particular satellite." (per Sullivan, at paragraph [0007]). On the other hand, Couillard is different from Sullivan because Couillard is unrelated to GPS receivers, as Couillard is concerned with methods of synchronizing a client station using a time server. Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that based on its intended use and operation, the frequency oscillator disclosed in Sullivan teaches away from its use in Couillard. Therefore, Sullivan teaches away from its combination with Couillard. Thus, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Consequently, the patentable subject

matter in Claims 16-17 and 25 should be advanced to allowance. Furthermore, based on at least the foregoing arguments with respect to the patentability of independent Claims 11 and 19, the Applicants believe that the rejections of independent Claims 11 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Couillard have been overcome; consequently, the Applicants request that Claims 16-17 and 25 be passed to allowance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 26-27 AND 40-42 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 26-27 and 40-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couillard in view of Fischer as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,450,395 ("Hostetter").

Independent Claim 26

Regarding Claim 26, the Office Action states:

> ***Regarding claim 26***, Couilard [sic] teaches a method of transmitting higher bandwidth signals between a first computing device and a second computing device comprising synchronizing said first computing device and a second computing device by way of using network time protocol (NPT) server (paragraphs [0047]-[0052]).
>
> Fischer teaches a method of transmitting voice and voice band data and other higher bandwidth signals between a first computing device and a second computing device comprising synchronizing said first computing device and a second computing device (paragraphs [0084]-[0085] and [0387]).
>
> It should be noticed that Couilard [sic] and Fischer, in combination, fails to suggest using synchronization to improve signal to noise of two devices. However, Hostetter teaches a suggestion of improving the signal-to-noise ratio between a plurality of transmitter and a receiver by a way of the transmitters and

receive to be synchronized (col.1, lines 55-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of a suggestion of improving the signal-to-noise ratio between a plurality of transmitter and a receiver by a way of the transmitters and receive to be synchronized, as taught by Hostetter into view of Couilard and Fischer in order to better quality of voice to voice-over-IP services.

See Office Action at page 7.

Claim 26 recites "A method of transmitting higher bandwidth voice band data between a first computing device and a second computing device comprising synchronizing said first computing device to said second computing device by way of using a network time protocol (NTP) server, said synchronizing performed to improve signal to noise ratio of said voice band data received at said first computing device and said second computing device."

The Office Action references Hostetter, at col. 1 lines 55-60, which states:

Horwitz describes in U.S. Pat. No. 4,644,523, issued 55 Feb. 17, 1987, a way to improve the signal-to-noise ratio in a CDMA receiver using a direct sequence spread spectrum wherein a plurality of transmitters and at least one receiver are synchronized to a common timing source.

As the Applicants had previously stated with respect to Claim 11, Couillard does not teach "a network time protocol (NTP) server" as recited in Claim 26. While Couillard teaches a "time server," Couillard does not teach a server that "uses a Network Time Protocol (NTP). Therefore, for this reason alone, the Office Action has not shown a teaching of what is recited in Claim 26. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Hostetter does not teach "synchronizing performed to improve *signal to noise ratio of said voice band data* received at

said first computing device and said second computing device," as recited in Claim 26. Hostetter, at col. 1 lines 55-60 describes a signal to noise ratio of a carrier signal received by a CDMA receiver over a direct sequence spread spectrum. Therefore, Hostetter does not teach "synchronizing performed to improve signal to noise ratio *of said voice band* data received at said first computing device and said second computing device." (emphasis denoted in italics) Thus, for this reason alone, the Office Action has not shown a teaching of what is recited in Claim 26.

Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully submits that Hostetter is not combinable with Couillard or with Fischer, since one of ordinary skill in the art knowledgeable with CDMA receivers would not be inclined to modify or combine the teachings provided by Couillard (i.e., the field of "time synchronization of a client station") or by Fischer (i.e., the field relating to a "frame-based communications network for providing voice services utilizing a nonsynchronous shared medium LAN integrated with a gateway to a synchronous network.").

The Applicants respectfully submit that because of at least the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 26 contains patentable subject matter and should be allowed. As a result of providing the foregoing arguments with respect to independent Claim 26, the Applicants may not have commented on all the remarks made by the Examiner regarding dependent Claim 27 but reserve the right to do so in the future should the need arise. Furthermore, for at least the reason that Claim 27 depends on allowable Claim 26, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 27 is in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 26-27.

Independent Claim 40

Regarding Claim 40, the Office Action states:

Regarding claim 40, Couilard [sic] teaches a system comprising:

a first computing device comprising:

a first processor; and

a first memory storing a first software, said first processor and said first memory used for running and executing said first software to request a first absolute time from a network time protocol (NTP) server, said first computing device receiving said first absolute time in response to said request; and wherein a second computing device receives a second absolute time from said network time protocol (NTP) server, resulting in synchronization of said first computing device to said second computing device, said synchronization reducing clock drift between said first computing device and said second computing device such that packets and signals transmitted between said first computing device and said second computing device is received paragraphs [0047]-[0052].

Fischer teaches a method of transmitting voice and voice band data between a first computing device and a second computing device comprising synchronizing said first computing device and a second computing device (paragraphs [0084]-[0085] and [0387]).

It should be noticed that Couilard [sic] and Fischer, in combination, fails to suggest using synchronization to improve signal to noise of two devices. However, Hostetter teaches a suggestion of improving the signal-to-noise ratio between a plurality of transmitter and a receiver by a way of the transmitters and receive to be synchronized (col.1, lines 55-60).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of a suggestion of improving the signal-to-noise ratio between a plurality of transmitter and a receiver by a way of the transmitters and receive to be synchronized, as taught by Hostetter into view of Couilard [sic] and Fischer in order to better quality of voice to voice-over-IP services.

See Office Action at page 8-9.

Claim 40 recites "A system comprising: a first computing device comprising: a first processor; and a first memory storing a first software, said first processor and said first memory used for running and executing said first software for first requesting a first absolute time from a network time protocol (NTP) server, said first computing device receiving said first absolute time in response to said first requesting; and wherein a second computing device executes a second software for second requesting a second absolute time from said NTP server, said second computing device receiving said second absolute time in response to said second requesting, resulting in synchronization of said first computing device to said second computing device, said synchronization reducing clock drift between said first computing device and said second computing device such that voice band data transmitted between said first computing device and said second computing device is received with a higher signal to noise ratio, said voice band data transmitted through a packet switched network, said NTP server executing a third software for generating said first and said second absolute times, wherein a first rate at which said first requesting is performed is varied based on a first synchronization accuracy of said first computing device and wherein a second rate at which said second requesting is performed is varied based on a second synchronization accuracy of said second computing device."

As was previously argued in Claim 26, the Office Action references Hostetter, at col. 1 lines 55-60, in an attempt to show a teaching of a "voice band data transmitted between said first computing device and said second computing device is received with a higher signal to noise ratio," as recited in Claim 40. As the Applicants had previously stated, Hostetter, at col. 1 lines 55-60 describes a signal to noise ratio of a carrier signal received by a CDMA receiver over a direct sequence spread spectrum. Therefore, Hostetter does not teach a "voice band data transmitted between said first computing device and said second computing device is received

with a higher signal to noise ratio," as recited in Claim 40. Thus, for at least this reason, the Office Action has not shown a teaching of what is recited in Claim 40.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner's cited references do not teach "said NTP server executing a third software for generating said first and said second absolute times, wherein a first rate at which said first requesting is performed is *varied based on a first synchronization accuracy of said first computing device* and wherein a second rate at which said second requesting is performed is *varied based on a second synchronization accuracy of said second computing device*," as recited in Claim 40 (emphasis denoted in italics). Consequently, the Applicants respectfully submit that the patentable subject matter in Claim 40 should be advanced to allowance.

The Applicants respectfully submit that because of the foregoing reasons, independent Claim 40 contains patentable subject matter and should be allowed. As a result of providing the foregoing arguments with respect to independent Claim 40, the Applicants may not have commented on all the remarks made by the Examiner regarding dependent Claims 41-42 but reserve the right to do so in the future should the need arise. Furthermore, for at least the reason that Claims 41-42 depend on allowable Claim 40, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 41-42 are in condition for allowance. Thus, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of Claims 40-42.

REJECTION OF CLAIM 28 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 28 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hostetter in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0204756 ("Ransom"). Regarding Claim 28, the Office Action states:

> ***Regarding claim 28***, Hostetter et al. ("Hostetter") teaches a method of improving the signal to noise ratio of voice band data comprising synchronizing computing devices (col.1, lines 55-60).
>
> It should be noticed that Hostetter fails to clearly teach the feature of syncing the computing devices to an NTP server. However, Ransom teaches such feature in paragraph [0122] for ensuring transferred messages having the correct time and their contents having accurate time.
>
> Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the feature of syncing the computing devices to an NTP server, as taught by Ransom, into view of Hostetter in order to provide accurate time to the transmitted messages.
>
> *See* Office Action at page 9.

Claim 28 recites "A method of improving the signal to noise ratio of voice band data comprising synchronizing one or more computing devices to a network time protocol (NTP) server."

As the Applicants had stated with respect to Claims 26 and 40, Hostetter, at col. 1 lines 55-60, describes a signal to noise ratio of a carrier signal received by a CDMA receiver over a direct sequence spread spectrum. Therefore, for at least this reason, Hostetter does not teach "improving the signal to noise ratio of voice band data," as recited in Claim 28. Hence, the Office Action does not show a teaching of what is recited in Claim 28. Consequently, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established. Therefore, the 103(a) rejection to Claim 28 should be withdrawn. Thus, for at least this reason, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 28 is in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 30-34 and 36-39

The Examiner has allowed Claims 30-34 and 36-39. Applicants appreciate and gratefully acknowledge the indication by the Examiner that Claims 30-34 and 36-39 have been allowed.

NEW CLAIMS 43-47

Dependent Claim 43

Applicants believe that dependent Claim 43 presents patentable subject matter. Applicants believe that new dependent Claim 43 is allowable for at least the reason that it depends on an allowable independent Claim 40.

Independent Claim 44 and Dependent Claims 45-47

Applicants believe that new independent Claim 44 recites patentable subject matter for at least the reason that the cited prior art does not teach what is recited in Claim 44. For example, the Applicants respectfully submit that Examiner's cited references do not teach "a frequency oscillator for receiving an adjustment parameter from said server for adjusting a phase of said frequency oscillator wherein a rate at which said receiving occurs is varied based on maintaining a particular synchronization accuracy," as recited in Claim 44. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claim 44 should be passed to allowance. Furthermore, for at least the reason that Claims 45-47 depend on an allowable independent Claim 44, Claims 45-47 should also be passed to allowance.

CONCLUSION

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicants believe that the pending claims (Claims 11-17, 19-28, 30-34, and 36-47) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited. Should anything remain in order to place the present Application in condition for allowance, or should the Examiner disagree or have any question regarding this submission, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at (312) 775-8246.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the Deposit Account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: June 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Roy B. Rhee/

Roy B. Rhee
Reg. No. 57,303

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661-2565
Telephone: (312) 775-8246
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100